UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/004,295	12/06/2001	Michael D. Bass	19421.00	8611

37833 7590 09/09/2005		EXAMINER	
LITMAN LAW OFFICES, LTD		TRAN, MAI T	
PO BOX 15035			
CRYSTAL CITY STATION		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
ARLINGTON, VA 22215		2129	

DATE MAILED: 09/09/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/004,295	BASS ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Mai T. Tran	2129	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *7/5/2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-19* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-3,5-8,10-12,14-17 and 19* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

REMARKS

The amendment filed July 5, 2005 has been entered. Claims 1 and 10 have been

amended. Claims 4, 9, 13, and 18 have been canceled. In regards to claim 19, on page 14, line 1

of the remarks, Applicants stated that they have amended claim 19. However, on page 8, line 1

in the listings of claims, Applicants listed claim 19 (Original). For compact prosecution,

Examiner interprets claim 19 as being amended. Claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-12, 14-17, and 19 are

pending.

CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim **19** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for

failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as

the invention.

In section a) of claim 19, applicants claimed a user charged with designing and

developing the job training program for the organization. However, in section b) and c)

applicants claimed the user's as originally filed. Applicants are required to particularly point out

which element being claimed.

Due to the 35 U.S.C 112 rejections above, the claims have been treated on their merits as

best understood by the examiner.

CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459

(1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims **1-3, 5-8, 10-12, 14-17,** and **19** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Simon, U.S. Patent No. 6,498,920 hereafter Simon, further in view of Blumer,

U.S. Patent No. 6,189,019 hereafter Blumer, further in view of Papadopoulos, U.S. Patent No.

6,099,320 hereafter Papadopoulos, and further in view of "Pathlore Learning Management

System fills 'skills gaps' through strategic partnership with SkillScape" printed in Business

Wire.

Claim 1

Simon teaches a computer software product that includes a medium readable by a

processor, the medium having stored thereon a set of instructions for creating and implementing

an architecture for designing a job training program for an organization, comprising:

a)   a first sequence of instructions which, when executed by the processor, causes

said processor to provide a set of analysis templates prompting a user for information for

assessing the organization's needs, capacities, and resources, and for saving the user's responses

to said templates in serialized objects (col. 3, lines 39-42). (It is considered that the needs of the

individual are organizational needs since the individual is a part of the organization);

b)   a second sequence of instructions which, when executed by the processor, causes

said processor to provide a set of design templates based upon a rule-based system analysis of

the user's responses to said analysis templates which prompt the user for information tailored to

a web-based instructional course for the organization, and causes said processor to receive the

user's responses to said templates, and to store the user's responses in serialized objects (col. 4,

lines 4-9). (Design templates are part of the original templates), the second sequence including

instructions for (a) developing and sequencing objectives (col. 7 lines 35-39), (b) specifying

instructional strategies and methods (col. 7 lines 52-55), (c) evaluating instructional objectives

(col. 7, lines 65-67), and (d) examining organizational issues (col. 7, lines 47-49); and

Simon fails to teach how to develop and sequence objectives, how to specify instructional

strategies and methods, how to evaluate instructional objectives, and how to examine

organizational issues. Papadopoulos teaches how to develop and sequence objectives, how to

specify instructional strategies and methods, how to evaluate instructional objectives, and how to

examine organizational issues. These steps help to define an appropriate curriculum for the

trainees, and also help with budgeting and justifying additional funding of the training program.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of

applicant's invention to combine Simon in view of Papadopoulos for the purpose of defining an

appropriate curriculum for the trainees, and help with budgeting and justifying additional

funding of the training program.

        c)   a third sequence of instructions which, when executed by the processor, causes

said processor to parse the serialized objects, provide the user with an outline tree of a web-based

instructional course and with nodes having content supplied by the serialized objects, accept user

editing of the outline tree and natural language editing of the nodes, and generate a web

application implementing a job training course from the edited outline tree and nodes, the third

set of instructions further including a set of instructions capable of producing a web application

job training course permitting multiple learners to access the course synchronously and

asynchronously for collaborative job training.

Simon fails to teach an outline tree of a web-based instructional course. Blumer teaches

an outline view of web documents. This method produces an easy to use, uncluttered screen

display. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the

time of applicant's invention to combine Simon in view of Blumer for the purpose of

representing linked documents in an easy to use, uncluttered screen display.

Simon fails to teach learners to access the course synchronously and asynchronously for

collaborative job training. Business Wire teaches learners to access the course synchronously

(paragraph 5, As the digital backbone ... collaborative events), and asynchronously for

collaborative job training (paragraph 5, register ... skills assessments). Therefore, it would have

been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to

combine Simon in view of Business Wire to add more value to their e-Learning initiatives.

Claim 2

Simon teaches the computer software product according to claim 1, further comprising a fourth sequence of instructions which, when executed by the processor, causes said processor to provide a set of guidelines for carrying out an analysis phase, a design phase, a development phase, an implementation/delivery phase, and an evaluation/maintenance phase for assessing the organization's job training and performance needs, the guidelines being accessible by said first, second and third sets of instructions (col. 4, lines 32-35).

Claim 3

Simon teaches the computer software product according to claim 1, wherein said first, second, and third sets of instructions are capable of being deployed on a computer network (col. 3, lines 7-24) and of being edited by multiple users in both synchronous and asynchronous modes in order to produce a web application for job training and performance by collaborative effort (col. 6, lines 13-14). A representative is not considered to be a single individual but anyone authorized by the company to edit since all that is required is an authorization. Whether both individuals are in the same room and/or logged on at the same time is merely a matter of choice and convenience for the individuals.

Claim 5

The computer software product according to claim 1, wherein said third set of instructions further includes a set of instructions for permitting a user to supplement textual material with graphics files, audio files, video files and multimedia files (abstract).

Simon fails to teach the supplement textual material with graphics files, audio files, video files and multimedia files. Papadopoulos teaches the supplement textual material with various

media for the purpose of creating a complex instruction for a particular operation. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to combine Simon in view of Papadopoulos for the purpose of creating a complex instruction for a particular operation.

Claim 6

Simon teaches the computer software product according to claim 1, wherein said third set of instructions further includes a set of instructions for permitting a user to supplement course material with tests, including user supplied questions and designations of correct answers (col. 5, lines 15-16), points assignments to the questions, standards for acceptable course progress (col. 5, line 26), and feedback for learners (col. 5, lines 29-30). Points assignments are considered to be equal for all questions.

Claim 7

Simon teaches the computer software product according to claim 1, wherein said third set of instructions further includes at least one application program interface function for integrating a course produced by said third set of instructions with a learning management system.

All computer-based training requires that the course work be loaded on to the computer and this is true of the system of Simon.

Claim 8

The computer software product according to claim 1, wherein said first set of instructions further includes instructions for:

a)   needs assessment;

b)   needs analysis;

c)   education analysis;

d)   learning analysis;

e)   job analysis;

f)   task analysis;

g)   learner analysis;

h)   resource analysis; and

i)   existing materials analysis.

Simon fails to teach needs assessment, needs analysis, education analysis, learning

analysis, job analysis, task analysis, learner analysis, resource analysis, and existing materials

analysis. Business Wire teaches needs assessment, needs analysis, education analysis, learning

analysis, job analysis, task analysis, learner analysis, resource analysis, and existing materials

analysis (Paragraph 4: "Competency ….business problem) to help organizations improve their

competitiveness by using the Internet for learning and sharing knowledge with their employees,

customers, and suppliers. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary

skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to combine Simon in view of Business Wire to

accomplish this goal.

Claim 10

Simon teaches an automated job training and performance tool for designing a job

training program for an organization, comprising:

a)   a computer having a microprocessor, an area of main memory for executing

program code under the direction of the microprocessor, and a disk storage device for storing

data and program code;

   b)   data input means for entering data input cognizable by said microprocessor;

   c)   a software program code stored in said disk storage device and executing in main memory under the direction of said microprocessor, the software program including:

   i)   analysis template means for providing a set of analysis templates prompting a user for information for assessing the organization's needs, capacities, and resources, and for saving the user's responses to said templates in serialized objects (col. 3, lines 39-42). (It is considered that the needs of the individual are organizational needs since the individual is a part of the organization);

   ii)   design template means for providing a set of design templates based upon a rule-based system analysis of the user's responses to said analysis templates which prompt the user for information tailored to a web-based instructional course for the organization, and causes said processor to receive the user's responses to said templates, and to store the user's responses in serialized objects (col. 4, lines 4-9) (Design templates are part of the original template), the design template further including means for: (a) developing and sequencing objectives (col. 7 lines 35-39), (b) specifying instructional strategies and methods (col. 7 lines 52-55), (c) evaluating instructional objectives (col. 7, lines 65-67); and (d) examining organizational issues (col. 7, lines 47-49); and

   Simon fails to teach how to develop and sequence objectives, how to specify instructional strategies and methods, how to evaluate instructional objectives, and how to examine organizational issues. Papadopoulos teaches how to develop and sequence objectives, how to specify instructional strategies and methods, how to evaluate instructional objectives, and how to examine organizational issues. These steps help to define an appropriate curriculum for the

trainees, and also help with budgeting and justifying additional funding of the training program.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of

applicant's invention to combine Simon in view of Papadopoulos for the purpose of defining an

appropriate curriculum for the trainees, and help with budgeting and justifying additional

funding of the training program.

        iii)   web author means for parsing the serialized objects, providing the user

with an outline tree of a web-based instructional course and with nodes having content supplied

by the serialized objects, accepting user editing of the outline tree and natural language editing of

the nodes, and generate a web application implementing a job training course from the edited

outline tree and nodes, the web author means including means for producing a web application

job training course permitting multiple learners to access the course synchronously and

asynchronously for collaborative job training.

Simon fails to teach an outline tree of a web-based instructional course. Blumer teaches

an outline view of web documents. This method produces an easy to use, uncluttered screen

display. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the

time of applicant's invention to combine Simon in view of Blumer for the purpose of·

representing linked documents in an easy to use, uncluttered screen display.

Simon fails to teach learners to access the course synchronously and asynchronously for

collaborative job training. Business Wire teaches learners to access the course synchronously

(paragraph 5, As the digital backbone … collaborative events), and asynchronously for

collaborative job training (paragraph 5, register … skills assessments). Therefore, it would have

been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to

combine Simon in view of Business Wire to add more value to their e-Learning initiatives.

Claim 11

Simon teaches the automated job training and performance tool according to claim 10,

wherein said software program code further comprises means for providing a set of guidelines

for carrying out an analysis phase, a design phase, a development phase, an

implementation/delivery phase, and an evaluation/maintenance phase for assessing the

organization's job training and performance needs, the guidelines being accessible by said

analysis template means, said design template means and said web author means (col. 4, lines

32-35).

Claim 12

Simon teaches the automated job training and performance tool according to claim 10,

wherein said analysis template means, said design template means, and said web author means

are capable of being deployed on a computer network (col. 3, lines 7-24) and of being edited by

multiple users in both synchronous and asynchronous modes in order to produce a web

application for job training and performance by collaborative effort (col. 6, lines 13-14). A

representative is not considered to be a single individual but anyone authorized by the company

to edit since all that is required is an authorization. Whether both individuals are in the same

room and/or logged on at the same time is merely a matter of choice and convenience for the

individuals.

Claim 14

The automated job training and performance tool according to claim 10, wherein said web author means further includes means for permitting a user to supplement textual material with graphics files, audio files, video files and multimedia files (abstract).

Simon fails to teach the supplement textual material with graphics files, audio files, video files and multimedia files. Papadopoulos teaches the supplement textual material with various media for the purpose of creating a complex instruction for a particular operation. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to combine Simon in view of Papadopoulos for the purpose of creating a complex instruction for a particular operation.

Claim 15

Simon teaches the automated job training and performance tool according to claim 10, wherein said web author means further includes means for permitting a user to supplement course material with tests, including user supplied questions and designations of correct answers (col. 5, lines 15-16), points assignments to the questions, standards for acceptable course progress (col. 5, line 26), and feedback for learners (col. 5, lines 29-30). Points assignments are considered to be equal for all questions.

Claim 16

Simon teaches the automated job training and performance tool according to claim 10, wherein said web author means further includes at least one application program interface function for integrating a course produced by said web author means with a learning management system.

All computer-based training requires that the course work be loaded on to the computer

and this is true of the system of Simon.

Claim 17

The automated job training and performance tool according to claim 10, wherein said

analysis template means further includes means for:

a)   assessing needs;

b)   analyzing needs;

c)   analyzing education;

d)   analyzing learning;

e)   analyzing jobs;

f)   analyzing tasks;

g)   analyzing learners;

h)   analyzing resources; and

i)   analyzing existing materials.

Simon fails to teach needs assessment, needs analysis, education analysis, learning

analysis, job analysis, task analysis, learner analysis, resource analysis, and existing materials

analysis. Business Wire teaches needs assessment, needs analysis, education analysis, learning

analysis, job analysis, task analysis, learner analysis, resource analysis, and existing materials

analysis (Paragraph 4: "Competency ....business problem) to help organizations improve their

competitiveness by using the Internet for learning and sharing knowledge with their employees,

customers, and suppliers. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary

skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to combine Simon in view of Business Wire to

accomplish this goal.

Claim 19

Simon teaches a computer software product that includes a medium readable by a

processor, the medium having stored thereon a set of instructions for creating and implementing

an architecture for designing a job training program for an organization, comprising:

a)   a first sequence of instructions which, when executed by the processor, causes

said processor to provide a set of analysis templates based upon rules-based systems prompting a

user charged with designing and developing the job training program for the organization for

information for assessing the organization's needs, capacities, and resources (col. 4, lines 12-19),

and causes said processor to receive the user's responses to said templates in serialized objects

(col. 3, lines 59-60), and compiles, weights, calculates, filters/sorts the user's responses (col. 3,

lines 31-36). (It is considered that the needs of the individual are organizational needs since the

individual is a part of the organization);

b)   a second sequence of instructions which, when executed by the processor, causes

said processor to provide a set of design templates based upon a rule-based systems for the user's

responses to said analysis templates and to said design templates which prompt the user for

information tailored to delivery systems and instructional strategies for courses for the

organization, and causes said processor to receive the user's responses to said templates in

serialized objects and compiles, weights, calculates, filters/sorts the user's responses in order to

produce a design plan for courses (col. 4, lines 4-9). (Design templates are part of the original

templates); and

c)   a third sequence of instructions which, when executed by the processor, causes

said processor to parse the serialized objects, provide the user with an outline tree of a web-based

instructional course and with nodes having content supplied by the serialized objects, accept user

editing of the outline tree and natural language editing of the nodes, and generate a web

application implementing a job training course from the edited outline tree and nodes.

Simon fails to teach an outline tree of a web-based instructional course. Blumer teaches

an outline view of web documents. This method produces an easy to use, uncluttered screen

display. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the

time of applicant's invention to combine Simon in view of Blumer for the purpose of

representing linked documents in an easy to use, uncluttered screen display.

RESPONSE TO ARGUMENTS

Applicants argue:

- on page 11, starting from line 10: *that obviousness cannot be shown by combining the*

  teachings of the prior art unless there is some teaching or incentive supporting the

  combination ... The Court said that "the showing must be clear and particular" ... to the

  end of page 13.

Applicants' arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The strongest rationale for combining references is a recognition that some <u>advantage</u> or

<u>expected beneficial result</u> would have been produced by their combination. In re Sermaker, 217

USPQ 1 (Fed. Cir. 1983): Carl Schenck, A.G. v. Norton Corp., 218 USPQ 698 (Fed. Cir. 1983).

The recognition may be an express statement in a reference, an implication that can be drawn

from one or more references, or a convincing line or reasoning based upon established principles.

Examiner has provided motivation for each and every combination of references when

Examiner rejected the claims under 35 U.S.C § 103(a). All of the cited motivations were in fact

express statements drawn from the references that recognized <u>advantage</u> or <u>expected beneficial</u>

<u>result</u> and not merely conclusory assertion. For example, "These steps help to define an

appropriate curriculum for the trainees, and also help with budgeting and justifying additional

funding of the training program" is a motivation found in Papadopoulos.

In response to applicants' argument that the number of references involved makes it

unlikely that one skilled in the art would look to all four references, it has been held that the

number of references does not have a bearing on the propriety of the rejection; theoretically such

could be infinite. Ex parte Fine, 1927 C.D. 84 (1926).

- on page 14, starting from line 1: "*With respect to independent Claim 19, ... design
  templates*" to the end of page 16.

Examiner respectfully disagrees. Applicants present the argument of an amended claim

(*Moreoever, what is generated is not guidance for a person designing a training program for a

group of employees, but a document or form directed towards a single employee*) and not of an

originally filed claim.

In response to applicants' argument about second and third deficiencies, the claims and

only the claims form the metes and bounds of the invention. "Office personnel are to give the

claims their broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the supporting disclosure. <u>In re Morris</u>,

127 F.3d 1048, 1054-55, 44USPQ2d 1023, 1027-28 (Fed. Cir. 1997). Limitations appearing in

the specification but not recited in the claim are not read into the claim. In re Prater, 415 F.2d,

1393, 1404-05, 162 USPQ 541, 550-551 (CCPA 1969)" (MPEP p 2100-8, c2, I 45-48; p 2100-9,

c 1, I 1-4). The Examiner has full latitude to interpret each claim in the broadest reasonable

sense. Examiner will reference prior art using terminology familiar to one of ordinary skill in the

art. Such an approach is broad in concept and can be either explicit or implicit in meaning.

Simon teaches template that directs the user through a series of screens, which could be

considered as objects. Simon also teaches these series of screen present the training content,

which is presented on a web site.

CONCLUSION

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this

Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this

final action.

CORRESPONDENCE INFORMATION

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mai T. Tran whose telephone number is (571) 272-4238. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00am-- 5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Anthony Knight can be reached on (571) 272-3687. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

M.T.T
Patent Examiner
Date: 8/24/2005

Anthony Knight
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Tech Center 2100